

the world and loses the little bit of security they have, well, the best we can do is say good-bye, good luck; here is a little check to tide you over; hope it gets better. No, Mr. Speaker, the deep problem is a social problem, the fragmentation of our culture.

Mr. Speaker, I also realize that in many places in America there are not the same economic conditions as where I live in Nebraska. We have abundant natural resources, a long tradition of stewardship of the land, and a strong agricultural and manufacturing economy. My State has also been very fiscally prudent, and that is the same way businesses are run and the same way families run their households.

This has contributed to vibrant economic conditions. In Lincoln, for instance, one company has more than 150 job openings. In Columbus, the manufacturing capital of Nebraska, the community has gone so far as to go to Michigan to try to find families with technical skills so they can move to our State.

Mr. Speaker, part of our policy deliberations here should be to try to understand this disconnect between persons who are trying, and have a real need for work, and the opportunities that are out there—yes, to demand accountability and responsibility, but also to forthrightly attack this problem of isolation in our culture. If we don't, we can just plod along and perhaps slowly get better as a country in the aggregate sense of the word, but much damage will be done to unrealized dreams and the potential of persons to find meaning with the creative gifts that they have been given.

Mr. Speaker, I will just end with this. In all fairness, I think we must do better. We must do better here. We must do better as a country than just emotional, political rhetoric, and find constructive solutions that are fair for all.

WAR ON POVERTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, when President Lyndon Johnson declared a war on poverty in his 1964 State of the Union address, the poverty rate in this, the richest country on Earth, was 19 percent. His Great Society legislation, a continuation of President Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal and President Harry Truman's Fair Deal, launch a plethora of programs and priorities to serve and protect the neediest and the most vulnerable among us.

At the time, President Johnson cautioned that the war on poverty would be long and difficult. But by 1973, only 9 years later, the poverty rate had been brought down to 11 percent. We were definitely winning the war on poverty. Unfortunately, many politicians found success, creating myths about the poor and inventing phantoms like the so-called "welfare queen." They popular-

ized a narrative that the war on poverty was not worth fighting, but nothing could be further from the truth.

For example, Medicare and Medicaid, both war on poverty initiatives, have made a tremendous difference in the health and security of older Americans and all Americans of modest means. These two very successful anti-poverty programs, when they were initiated, the poverty rate among seniors was over 30 percent. Today, the poverty rate among seniors is under 10 percent. By what measure can one conclude that these two programs are failures?

In addition to Medicare and Medicaid, President Johnson signed into law the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. This law launched VISTA—Volunteers in Service to America—Head Start, TRIO, and a slew of other very successful community-action programs. TRIO did not fail. In fact, many Members of this body on both sides of the aisle would not be here today were it not for Upward Bound, Talent Search, and the Special Students Concerns programs.

Lest we forget, about 6 months after President Johnson launched the war on poverty, Congress responded to his call and passed the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and a year later the landmark Voting Rights Act of 1965. These two vital laws created educational and employment opportunities for women and minorities that allowed many of us to fulfill our dreams and aspirations. In the communities many of us grew up in, many Americans were able to vote for the first time in their lives. There is no better way to wage a war on poverty than their freedom to choose and unfettered access to the franchise.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., whose 85th birthday we celebrate today, once famously said:

Of all the forms of inequality, injustice in health care is the most shocking and inhumane.

The record is pretty clear that, in recent years, the number one cause of bankruptcies to American families has been health care expenses. That is why I often call the Affordable Care Act, the civil rights act of the 21st century.

This groundbreaking new law is already having a positive difference. It is giving all American families the security of quality, affordable health care. We still have much work to do. Persistent poverty continues to be a serious challenge, and we in the Congressional Black Caucus are serious about meeting that challenge. Our 10-20-30 initiative targets communities of need for effective economic development through infrastructure investments that create jobs and lay foundations for long-term economic growth. The 10-20-30 approach, which this body authorized in the rural development section of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, proved highly successful.

This effective poverty-fighter should be expanded to other sections of the budget as we continue the long, and

often torturous, search of a more perfect Union.

NO FUNDING FOR UNESCO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, each year the United States taxpayers are on the hook for over \$7 billion in contributions to the United Nations.

While some of this money is given by the United States on a voluntary basis and goes toward funding some helpful agencies at the U.N., a large portion of these funds are compulsory payments over which we have no oversight. Without the ability to perform oversight and mandate transparency and accountability, we have seen entities within the United Nations drift far away from the ideals and objectives it was designed to achieve.

One need look no further than one of its main bodies, the Human Rights Council, where just this past November, the U.N. General Assembly selected China, Russia, and my native homeland of Cuba—where my family and I were forced to flee Castro's Communist regime, and where terrible human rights violations have been occurring for over half a century.

This is the same organization where a rogue regime like Iran, that had no less than six U.N. Security Councils resolutions against it for its illicit nuclear program, was actually selected to chair a disarmament conference. Only in the U.N. would this happen.

It is the same organization that spends a great deal of time and effort adopting resolutions against our friend and ally, the democratic Jewish State of Israel, ignoring the brutality of the Assad regime and the crimes that it commits against the Syrian people.

Perhaps nowhere is this agenda more prevalent at the U.N. than at UNESCO, where in 2011 that entity allowed a nonexistent state of Palestine into its anti-American and anti-Israel organization.

This move triggered decades-old law in the United States that prohibits us from funding any agency at the U.N. that admits Palestine or any other nonrecognized organization into its membership. By recognizing Palestine at UNESCO, that entity is attempting to grant the Palestinian Authority a de facto recognition as a state before it works out a peace settlement with Israel, and it actually undermines the Israeli-Palestinian peace process.

The powers that be at UNESCO knew what they were doing when they did this, and they knew that there would be repercussions; yet they chose to test our mettle and our willingness to do the right thing, to stand by our ally and to stick to our principles and to stick to our U.S. laws.

For a time it appeared as though they may have been right. The administration has made no secret of its desire to seek a waiver to this prohibition in order to turn the money spigot